

An open letter to single mothers.

241 upvotes | 5 September, 2013 | by Whisper

You have been linked here because you asked why you couldn't find a relationship, or why you couldn't find one you wanted. I have written this same answer to so many of you, so many times, that now it's time to write it in one place, once and for all.

You've probably noticed that the men who used to pay attention to you are now staying away in droves. Perhaps you are wondering what's wrong with men. Perhaps you are wondering what's wrong with you. But you are certainly wondering what's wrong.

The first thing you must realize is that men are acting rationally and in their own best interest. Their reluctance to date you is not a form of neurosis, nor is it a character flaw somehow shared by an entire sex. You have made mistakes in your past that make you a bad catch, or, at the very least, a worse catch than you were before you made them.

There are two major reasons why this is so.

- **First, you have a child.**

This has several effects.

Obviously, the most important of these is that you are now a package deal. A package deal, not just with a child, but with *someone else's* child. Now, some men do not want children, and some men do. But even the ones who do, want to have children when they are ready, they want to have *their own* children, and they want to raise those children from the beginning. You might think children are just loveable, especially your children, but it is generally women who love children. Men love *their* children.

And it's no good to say "I wouldn't expect him to co-parent with me". There's no avoiding it. Any man in your life, who is closer than a one-night hookup, or a friend with benefits, is going to be in contact with those children, and is going to have responsibilities, express or implied, because of that.

Another, more subtle effect is that any man can now never be higher than priority three. If you are at all a decent mother, the most important thing in your life is your child (or children). After that comes you... because, after all, you have a responsibility to your children. That means he is, at most, priority three. Now, a man doesn't mind taking a back seat to *his* children, because they are his, and he feels the same way about them. But a stranger's? Not a good bargain.

- **Second, you have a poor track record with relationships.**

You were once in a relationship, which you saw as serious enough to have a child in. That relationship failed.

Now, this is either your fault, his fault, or some combination of the two. If it's your fault, you are a bad relationship partner. If it's his fault, you are a poor judge of character and a bad decision maker. If it's some combination of the two... well, you guessed it.

Now, perhaps not every woman whose relationship fails is going to take future relationships so lightly. Perhaps there are a few rare men out there who can truly turn psycho with *no warning signs whatsoever*. Perhaps a lot of things. But consider this: every man who gets involved with you is making a bet on you. Why would he bet on someone with a history of failed relationships, when there are women available who don't have that?

Which brings us to our summary point.

You may be thinking that, yes, all this is true, but you are still a pretty good person. You might be attractive, funny, charming, nice, considerate, a lot of things. Don't you deserve a second chance?

It's not about what you deserve. Men are not impartial gods charged with running the universe, and given infinite cosmic powers with which to do so. They are not here on earth to make sure things are fair to *you*. They are here to live their own lives, and seek their own happiness.

Which means that any good quality you have might be nice, but they will seek it out in someone who doesn't come prepackaged with another man's child. If you are beautiful, there are beautiful women who aren't single mothers. If you are nice, there are nice women who aren't single mothers. If you are charming, considerate, low-maintenance, feminine, a wildcat in bed... well, you guessed it. There is only one man in the universe for whom you will retain your full measure of relationship-worthiness, and that is the actual father of your child.

Otherwise, the only way that any of your good qualities can outweigh your unwelcome additional feature is if he could never hope to attract the single, unburdened version of you. This means you are going to have to lower your standards. A lot.

In other words, no matter why you left the father of your child, whatever he was, whoever you get afterwards will be *not as attractive*. If he cheated, if he was boring, if he got fat, if he didn't have a job, if he was unconfident and awkward, if he was an addict, a gambler, whatever... your next one is not going to be better. Get used to it. Find a less attractive man whose drawbacks you can live with.

Or hope to find one of the few single fathers out there. Or swear off relationships altogether.

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

thestyrbjorn • 46 points • 5 September, 2013 12:59 AM [\[recovered\]](#)

As a man who spend 8 month in relationship with single mother (much older than me as well) I agree with this. I am bit smarter now and know what I will be getting myself into with single mothers. I don't have anything against them, but it is just as you said.

[deleted] • 61 points • 5 September, 2013 04:03 AM

As a man who spent months in a relationship with a single mother (older than me) and then married her, I endorse this message. Heed: Do not proceed as I have.

I can add at least 5 points to /u/Whisper 's letter, starting with:

If an enforceable joint custody agreement exists, in marrying you I have made another man my master.

Choose an arbitrary distance, less than 100 miles. Take out your washable Crayola marker and a map. Then draw a circle with that radius around your home.

You cannot leave that circle. Not for a job that triples your earnings, not for that sabbatical overseas, not even for a long vacation to see your hillbilly relatives in Appalachia.

It's a soft prison. And she will *never* appreciate or even understand your sacrifice. You are number three.

thestyrbjorn • 18 points • 5 September, 2013 11:31 AM [\[recovered\]](#)

Agreed. I never had any freedom to do what I wanted. My plans for degree were shattered because she was whining about me studying in another town. I was gullible enough to give up to it. Also used to get a lot of crap because I could not match up to her kits dad in bed.

[deleted] 5 September, 2013 01:32 PM

[\[permanently deleted\]](#)

[deleted] • 3 points • 5 September, 2013 02:01 PM

I made that mistake once, and limited the places I applied for PhD programs. Didn't get in that year. Doing the whole thing again, but this time around I'm a lot wiser.

[deleted] • 6 points • 5 September, 2013 03:27 PM

Sounds like you're #4 in that case: kid>her>ex>you

cooledcannon • 7 points • 5 September, 2013 06:57 AM

What the fuck. How does the 100 mile prison work?

WN5h • 19 points • 5 September, 2013 07:54 AM

Certain custody agreements require that custodial parents stay a certain distance from one another so the children can regularly see both parents.

last_to_know • 4 points • 5 September, 2013 02:44 PM

Wtf? Doesn't that violate some kind of human rights regarding mobility?

[deleted] • 6 points • 5 September, 2013 03:02 PM

no it doesn't, because you can simply forgo all custody. The custody agreement says: if you move past a certain distance from where you currently live, you cannot have custody of your children. If you don't want custody, you're free to move

[deleted] 5 September, 2013 03:04 PM

[permanently deleted]

last_to_know • 3 points • 5 September, 2013 03:23 PM

Well I live in Canada, and it's in our Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

[deleted] 5 September, 2013 03:28 PM

[permanently deleted]

MayorMoonbeam • 1 point • 18 January, 2014 01:30 AM

It's not a social contract, it's (a component of) our constitution haha

SupALupRT • 1 point • 5 September, 2013 08:46 PM

No. A parent has a right to see their kid, in some states the fucked up courts will let one parent move the kids away to another area. I'm of the opinion if someone wants to move away, they have to leave the kid with the other.

jdaero16 points 5 September, 2013 05:43 AM [recovered]

I really like kids. They are so curious and brave and it's a joy to watch them go about learning and exploring the world. But no amount of that is going to make me want to date a single mother.

People make mistakes and shit happens. I'm not going to shame them for that. But I ain't signing up for the clean up crew.

[deleted] • 6 points • 5 September, 2013 01:32 PM

Absolutely beautiful and spot on. My favorite line:

But I ain't signing up for the clean up crew.

LMS_THEORY • 89 points • 5 September, 2013 12:55 AM

I think this letter should be directed at single moms who INSIST on dating men with no kids. Men with kids from previous relationships have to be reasonable since they're in the same situation to a lesser extent

Whisper[S] • 40 points • 5 September, 2013 01:00 AM

Yeah, I might edit in the idea of dating a single father. However, there are a lot less single fathers than single mothers, so this is not a realistic solution on a broader scale.

[deleted] 5 September, 2013 06:35 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 24 points • 5 September, 2013 01:27 PM

Also, many women **with** children refuse to date them because they want resources for **their** children

and don't want to have to share that man's resources with the mother of his kids.

[deleted] 5 September, 2013 01:02 PM

[permanently deleted]

PIBagent • 7 points • 5 September, 2013 02:30 PM

depends on how he died:

If he died in a war, from a major (non-sexual) disease, pure accident then yes its an exception.

If he died as a result of something gang related, doing some sort of illegal activity, died from over exposure to an STD, etc then no shes still a bad judge of character.

wuy3 • 1 point • 10 September, 2013 10:53 PM

I would argue the 2nd point still applies. Yes its weaker because shes no longer a bad judge of character. But other men will still be able to find alternatives to a single mom without the "packaged" child. As well as other points that follow:

"Otherwise, the only way that any of your good qualities can outweigh your unwelcome additional feature is if he could never hope to attract the single, unburdened version of you. This means you are going to have to lower your standards. A lot.

Which is unfortunate for the mother but that's life.

[deleted] • 6 points • 5 September, 2013 03:31 AM

there are a lot less single fathers than single mothers

Hah, even when the justic system is in their favour it doesn't help

Jake0024 • 12 points • 5 September, 2013 02:25 PM

I think this letter should be directed at single *parents* who INSIST on dating *people* with no kids.

Mengs87 • 74 points • 5 September, 2013 03:50 AM

Also...once the courts establish that a relationship has been formed by the man and your spawn, then the man is liable for child support. So...nothing personal, ladies. I've got enough problems paying bills on my own.

Jake0024 • 13 points • 5 September, 2013 02:28 PM

This is only true if there was never another man responsible for them before you got involved. If you're dating a woman who (for instance) doesn't know or never documented the father of her child(ren), the next man she marries for some reason becomes liable.

If someone else already has the job, you have to adopt them to take on that responsibility. The ex would have to keep paying child support even though she's remarried (but not alimony, generally).

the_red_scimitar • 2 points • 5 September, 2013 07:17 PM

That's NOT what he said - he said "a relationship has been formed" - so if you give the kid a birthday party, she claims the kid "formed a relationship" and...?

No, I seriously doubt that is how it works.

30years • 4 points • 5 September, 2013 05:37 PM

I'm kinda thinking marrying a woman with children you're paying someone else's child support no matter what the courts would say. It would be foolish to think you're not going to be paying for food, shelter, clothing, Xbox Gold memberships, gas, cars, etc. for that kid even though it is not yours.

I can't see any upside in doing it.

Now if you get divorced, that flow of cash to those kids might end (if the courts don't force it), but why establish that flow of cash in the first place by marrying the woman?

the_red_scimitar • 1 point • 5 September, 2013 07:16 PM

I've NEVER heard of this one. I have serious doubts that it is as simple as that. References? Especially as to this being a matter of law generally?

RedBigMan • 14 points • 5 September, 2013 04:09 AM

Now, a man doesn't mind taking a back seat to his children, because they are his, and he feels the same way about them. But a stranger's? Not a good bargain.

Pretty much nailed it there.

It's called looking out for #1 for a reason. Men without kids are looking out for themselves first and foremost. Just like women who are single mothers are looking out for their best interests because their interests are to make sure their offspring are taken care of (hence the oft repeated 'alpha fucks, beta bucks').

[deleted] 5 September, 2013 01:49 AM

[permanently deleted]

RedBigMan • 25 points • 5 September, 2013 04:05 AM

Remember the number of cats she has is a good indicator of how much sanity she has. 1 cat = sane, 10 cats = insane

JoshtheAspie • 13 points • 5 September, 2013 06:02 PM

I'd say that if she's working, 2 cats is just as sane as 1, since cats need company too, and many people get a 2nd cat to help keep their first cat happy. Higher expense, but not double, and then you've got 2 fuzzballs, and both of them are happier and healthier.

Once you get 3 cats though, it starts getting worrying.

RedBigMan • 1 point • 5 September, 2013 06:28 PM

Well yeah, the general theory is more cats = more insane. So 2 might be a little more crazy than 1 but less crazy than 3 and sane compared to the one with 28 cats running loose in her house.

JoshtheAspie • 5 points • 5 September, 2013 06:52 PM

I'm cool with the general theory. I just don't think that it holds when going from 0 to 1, or 1 to 2. I think the upward slope starts at the jump from 2 to 3.

RedBigMan • 9 points • 5 September, 2013 07:01 PM

Maybe the scale is exponential or logarithmic which is why 1-2 cats seems relatively sane?

$$1^1 = 1$$

$$2^2 = 2$$

$$3^3 = 27$$

$$4^4 = 256$$

$$5^5 = 3125$$

...

t21spectre • 15 points • 5 September, 2013 09:36 PM

$$2^2 = 4$$

FTFY

JoshtheAspie • 5 points • 5 September, 2013 07:28 PM

Well, if we're looking at non-linear slopes, what about the fact that people tend to be happier and healthier if they have a few pets than if they have none, due to the companionship? That could indicate that someone living otherwise alone with 1-2 pets could be "saner" than someone with 0 pets.

I'm not going to make any definitive statements about the difference between 0 and 1, other than I don't think there's sufficient evidence in an increase in mental issues.

For the number of cats above 0, I think that if you graph the cumulative crazy, you'll wind up with something resembling an s-curve. Past 2, the amount of crazy starts increasing very quickly... but how much difference in crazy is there between having 10 cats, and 20? Between having 20 and 30?

If you scale the curve such that 0 is theoretical complete sanity, and 1 is total insanity, you'll have a horizontal asymptote at 1.

[deleted] • 5 points • 5 September, 2013 10:27 PM

Uh, isn't this true for any animal other than fish or those tiny lovebirds at the pet store? I mean, ten iguanas, ten parrots, ten horses, ten dogs, ten whatever are more than I can handle.

[deleted] 5 September, 2013 05:57 AM

[permanently deleted]

just_an_ordinary_guy • 24 points • 5 September, 2013 06:46 AM

Neurotic dog = poorly disciplined dog => Poorly disciplined person.

Well behaved and submissive dog => This dog seems well trained => This person has the discipline to stick with something and do it right. They will do things that they don't like (like maintaining a neat living space) and not fucking whine about life sucking.

This is just one example that I have observed. Your statement is incredibly true.

[deleted] 5 September, 2013 09:59 AM

[permanently deleted]

DasEwigeLicht • 13 points • 5 September, 2013 01:35 PM

Man with dog = literally Hitler

TechnoL33T • 10 points • 5 September, 2013 10:26 AM

That seems like a pretty broken scale...

[deleted] 5 September, 2013 03:59 AM*

[permanently deleted]

Whisper[S] • 32 points • 5 September, 2013 06:28 AM

Hey, you do what you want with your life. You wanna raise some burnout's kid in place of your own, fine. You wanna get with women who have kids with druggies, fine.

But don't pretend that's what makes you a man.

Men don't exist to burn their lives fixing others' mistakes. We are not born to serve. We are human beings in our own right. You're not going to shame anyone here into acting like a tool. Fear of criticism is not a badge of courage.

Perhaps my words, or other people's, stung enough so you felt the need to defend your honor. But this isn't about you. This is bigger than you. This is about how men get taken for granted. As a culture, we have dismantled the family, moved from a family model to a child support model, and women are still expecting that *other* men are going to take up the slack.

Well, you might wanna do it, but don't try to get other men to follow suit. Because it isn't in their best interests. And taunting them might make you feel better, but it's not going to make them lose sight of what's good for them.

[deleted] • 6 points • 5 September, 2013 03:24 PM

You wanna get with women who have kids with druggies, fine.

Man this guy is gonna have a great time when he discovers epi-genetics and what it (insert strong maybe, due to pending research on the topic) means for those kids.

throwaway-o • 36 points • 5 September, 2013 04:12 AM

I can see how it's hard for some people, but I'm man enough to give a little girl a loving father instead of a dead beat druggy.

I give this one 4 Hamsters.

[deleted] 5 September, 2013 04:16 AM

[permanently deleted]

americnleprchaun • 19 points • 5 September, 2013 04:26 AM

yep, 4 of 'em. On a scale from 1-5, that's about as irrational as buying lottery tickets in place of saving for retirement.

[deleted] 5 September, 2013 10:53 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 11 points • 5 September, 2013 01:32 PM

Yes. And we usually don't deal with the imaginary hamster sets, but they're useful for describing radii of convergence in solving differential hamster equations with series.

[deleted] 5 September, 2013 05:22 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 3 points • 5 September, 2013 06:38 PM

Yes, the irrational hamster set in included.

americnleprchaun • 2 points • 5 September, 2013 02:06 PM

I dunno man, I'm not a mathematician.

[deleted] 5 September, 2013 04:28 AM

[permanently deleted]

throwaway-o • 19 points • 5 September, 2013 05:02 AM*

The hamster spinning in its wheel inside the person's skull is the allegory we use to refer to rationalization.

You do X because of Y, but since Y is a psychically costly / socially disparaging / terrible / irrational reason, you quickly concoct a more believable / plausible / socially acceptable excuse, Z to explain away why you did X. To others, but mostly to yourself.

That's what hamstering refers to.

I am about to be married, look handsome, my fiancée is beautiful and very smart, I drive a collectible sportscar, we live in a swanky place in SF, I work for one of the biggest tech companies in the world doing the things I love and paid well, while wearing t-shirts and eating there. My life is generally fucking awesome. Just answering your question of how one of us looks in real life.

I am sorry you grew up without a father. I am working every day to make this world a better, more loving and sane world so people don't have to grow up without their parents.

[deleted] 5 September, 2013 05:08 AM

[permanently deleted]

throwaway-o • 13 points • 5 September, 2013 05:18 AM

We all do that to one degree or another. It's just a matter of degree. For example, how many women did you pass for your current wife? What were your dating options before you met her? I am sure she is your best choice and I don't think that's bad, but the *choices you had* vis a vis how you explain the *choices* you made are a matter of rationalization.

[deleted] 5 September, 2013 05:22 AM

[permanently deleted]

PIBagent • 3 points • 5 September, 2013 02:43 PM

I don't see how taking over as a father is irrational?

So then tell us why you think it's a rational choice. Is it because your system of

values/honor tells you that it's what REAL MEN(tm) do. If so what gives you the right to force your value system on us or any other man.

From a purely logical standpoint it makes no sense to take on the additional expense of child-rearing when the children in question are not yours so I'm rather interested curious on how it benefits you to do so.

[deleted] 5 September, 2013 10:02 AM

[permanently deleted]

RedBigMan • 5 points • 5 September, 2013 12:17 PM

Only valid reason to raise another man's kid is if you yourself are sterile and it's an adoption not just showing up to step-daddy.

JoshtheAspie • 3 points • 5 September, 2013 06:12 PM

Not necessarily.

A couple with their own children may choose to foster, or adopt, as an act of loving charity. It's entirely valid.

Also, adopting the child of relatives who can't take care of the kid, or who got killed in an accident, are both entirely sane on the genetic propagation level, since the child shares a large number of genes with you, but *also* kind act of charity.

Many adoptions are performed by family members, rather than by complete strangers.

Adopting also allows you to be the nurture portion of the nature/nurture balance, and propagate ideas that way, even if they don't entirely stick.

RedBigMan • 1 point • 5 September, 2013 06:34 PM

You have some good points. I will concede that conscious decisions to foster or adopt are usually well thought out in advance since it takes extra money to be able to afford to do so.

Also the instances of family members is good too because of what you said sharing large number of genes. It's not the same as hooking up with a single mother and being stuck with raising some stranger's offspring.

cooledcannon • 1 point • 5 September, 2013 07:02 AM

I don't see how taking over as a father is irrational? I grew up without a father so I could relate.

Being a single parent is a systemic problem. In an abstract way, by not dealing with their shit, less people are going to be single parents, and less children will suffer. If you support single parents(especially more than non-single parents) then more children in the future have to deal with the fucked up situation.

ofc that particular girl suffers, but I guess its better to be a friend or something to the girl if you like her but not deal with the parent(unless the mom is a cool person. still wouldnt get in a relationship tho)

(ignore all of the above if the single mom became one through no fault of her own: ie. her

husband died or she got raped or something)

americnleprchaun • 0 points • 5 September, 2013 02:05 PM

I'm only saying taking over as a father is irrational for the following reasons:

You are now responsible as a father to a child you share no real connection to.

Should you divorce, chances are good you will end up paying child support for someone else's decision.

Not only that, but the chances of you getting any sort of custody are infinitesimally low (for better or worse).

And finally, you're potential children will inherently take less priority on account of having a sibling, who also needs attention.

With that said, love is often irrational and I don't blame or look down upon your decisions, it is your life after all. In short, I would have made different choices than you, but we're totally different people so I don't suppose it matters much.

orographic • 18 points • 5 September, 2013 02:47 PM

I've been with my girl 2 years, she had a one year old when I came into the picture. The girl calls me dad, I support her and treat her as my kid. Her bio is a druggy loser, no kid deserves to grow up without a dad to love them. I have my own kid now with the girl, cause of course I wanted my own.

I can see how it's hard for some people, but I'm man enough to give a little girl a loving father instead of a dead beat druggy.

It's funny getting down voted by a bunch of pussies who need support and need to read shit on how to be a man. I work construction, make \$40 an hour, raise a family and am comfortably head of my household. not sitting around playing with my dick like you kiddos.

You see this post TRP? This is what shaming men to fit an imperative looks like. Some alpha bad boy knocked up his wife and now he is busting his ass in construction to pay for it. Notice the shaming language in his post.

"I'm man enough to (fit the feminine imperative of alpha fucks beta bucks)"

Just wait until she meets another drugged out loser and wants a divorce. Is he man enough to pay child support and alimony too?

[deleted] 5 September, 2013 02:53 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 11 points • 5 September, 2013 03:26 PM

Just remember buddy, no matter what you agree/disagree with in life, never let your own anger become denial.

nonservator • 0 points • 6 September, 2013 02:43 PM

u mad bro?

30303030303030 • 25 points • 5 September, 2013 10:57 AM*

Her bio is a druggy loser

and your girlfriend was still fucking him with no protection, great catch, and you made her a mother of your own...

I'm man enough

Nope, you are a cuckold, raising and paying for child of another man, and not only a man, but a "druggy loser".

It's your life, good luck.

luxury_banana • 8 points • 5 September, 2013 12:33 PM

Brutal but 100% true. Probably a reason I have upvoted 22 of your comments/posts.

salami_inferno • 12 points • 5 September, 2013 09:44 AM

I can see how it's hard for some people, but I'm man enough to give a little girl a loving father instead of a dead beat druggy.

Yeah, it's super manly to raise another mans children for him while you bend over and get fucked in the ass.

[deleted] • 11 points • 5 September, 2013 03:25 PM

"I'm not getting fucked up the ass if I *like* it!!!" -rationalization

kjax67 • 10 points • 5 September, 2013 03:43 AM

<http://youtu.be/iaCFYprmzZ4>

I think that's a fairly spot-on argument, that dovetails.

And I'll admit that I do feel sorry for some (few) of those single moms. Some of 'em marry a guy whose only real interest in her is dumping loads (the cheater- bad choice, mom), and some become widows early in life. But it still works out the same for most- men not wanting "the package." Some get hoodwinked, no doubt, but it what it is.

Hard row to hoe... and that IS life.

[deleted] • 23 points • 5 September, 2013 12:38 PM

It's not about what you deserve. Men are not impartial gods charged with running the universe, and given infinite cosmic powers with which to do so. They are not here on earth to make sure things are fair to you. They are here to live their own lives, and seek their own happiness.

That's gonna ruffle some entitlement feathers.

throwaway-o • 10 points • 5 September, 2013 04:12 AM

Whoa. Brutal. Honest. I like it.

TRP_ • 18 points • 5 September, 2013 04:15 AM

Especially young single moms. I have a female friend who is extremely attractive and fun to be around, but got knocked up at the age of 19. I have watched so many men date her and end up breaking it off due to the child. Only thing she can really do now is settle for some older beta schmuck who will raise her two year old kid for the sole reason of having a wife. This man will invest emotionally and financially while she will give nothing.

30years • 9 points • 5 September, 2013 05:49 PM

I am new here, so if this is off based I am willing to consider it, but I would add this red flag when considering dating a woman with children:

A woman can be on her best behavior while dating you. She can temporarily make you think she is exactly what you want in a woman. She can be kind and sexy and interesting.

But if you really want to know who she is, look at her kids. Even at 2-3 years old, you can see whether they are polite, disciplined, etc. They are the longer-term product of her consistent choices. Watch what happens when the kid gets out of line. How does the mom deal with it? That's the real key to understanding her.

Almost every human being would say child rearing is the most important thing they do. **If she is lazy, uncaring, unskilled in parenting, what makes you think that woman would be any different in a relationship with you?**

[deleted] • 6 points • 5 September, 2013 11:01 PM

She lost her temper at her 3yo boy in public (he was being a bratty little shit, but her reaction was still over the top), screaming at him and then looking defeated, sighing and saying "What did I do to deserve this?".

ALL of the previous attraction instantly vanished that moment.

30years • 3 points • 6 September, 2013 04:02 AM

Good for you. You've got sense.

InsaneEngineer • 1 point • 10 September, 2013 02:16 PM

Oddly enough, I went through the same thing, but I just watched her try to take care of a kitten.

[deleted] • 6 points • 5 September, 2013 07:33 AM

Can I steal this and post is elsewhere?

Whisper[S] • 4 points • 5 September, 2013 03:36 PM

Yeah, sure.

[deleted] • 3 points • 6 September, 2013 04:50 AM

Just link it back here, is the standard Internet protocol.

well_i_guess • 5 points • 5 September, 2013 01:04 PM

I feel compelled to make a POF account and put this in the about me section, it would reach the target audience for sure.

[deleted] • 3 points • 5 September, 2013 01:07 AM

Change the first "wonder" to "wondering"

Whisper[S] • 4 points • 5 September, 2013 01:56 AM

Thanks.

Futsushi • 6 points • 5 September, 2013 06:50 AM

Great post, it will never sink in and the question always comes up again and again because what you wrote is not what media says is true.

Still... great post

[deleted] 5 September, 2013 03:43 AM

[permanently deleted]

TRPsubmitter • 17 points • 5 September, 2013 08:12 AM

A few years ago, I also dated a 21 year old with a 2 year old kid. Korean girl in Korea and by far the hottest girl I've ever been with. I'm talking about better than celebrity level looks/body. My friends would be like speechless around her. She did car racing modeling. She was also filthy rich from her divorce settlement (and paid for everything as well; even took me on a vacation). Was a sweetheart, easy going, low maintenance, agreeable in everything, and amazing in bed. She never asked me to take care of her kid either (I more acted like the kid's friend).

But, don't fall into NAWALT. She had major issues simply because of her abusive ex-husband, her kid who always would demand attention (bratty kid due to no father influence), and her inability to connect and truly trust people. The relationship fell apart because she couldn't handle those issues and would clam up.

So, despite many things about her being the best I've ever had, she had tons of other issues directly relating to her past failed marriage and her single motherhood. Basically, there is always going to be this secret area that she will never let you access.

[deleted] 5 September, 2013 08:41 AM

[permanently deleted]

TRPsubmitter • 23 points • 5 September, 2013 09:05 AM

Unclear if this was your implication, but if so, it's *also* funny that a brand new account who obviously hasn't been on TRP too long assumes that I'm White when I'm actually Korean-American, speak Korean, and have made TONS of posts about Asian-American game and Asian girls here on TRP.

As far as the white guy in Asia thing, you're preaching to the choir, dude. That being said, I don't blame them for wanting to get laid with girls who are superior to American girls in terms of personality, body weight & looks.

RedSunBlue • 9 points • 5 September, 2013 09:16 AM

white

FYI /u/TRPsubmitter is Korean-American.

truthspieler • -9 points • 5 September, 2013 10:08 AM

ok that is very important thank you

cooledcannon • 3 points • 5 September, 2013 07:05 AM

I may be in the minority here, but if it wasn't the mom's fault something bad happened (ie her husband died or she had a rape baby or some other situation) then I don't think I would be deterred from dating or something. I would have massive doubts about staying long term but still

Max__Power • 15 points • 5 September, 2013 08:40 AM

Until the courts decide you formed a relationship with the child and order you to start handing your money over.

ThePacketSlinger • 2 points • 5 September, 2013 05:07 PM

My understanding of this was that only happens when you legally adopt the child, or sign the birth certificate when it's born.

Max ___ Power • 2 points • 5 September, 2013 07:19 PM

Your understanding is incorrect. If you date a single mother and form a relationship with child which the family court system deems a fatherly role (i.e. taking the child back to school shopping, allowing it to call you daddy, etc.), then you can be ordered to pay child support to mother regardless of biological father, legal guardian or who is on the birth certificate. When the state can pass single mother money support on to a male, they will in a heartbeat because their objective is to minimize their own payments.

[deleted] • 2 points • 5 September, 2013 10:24 PM

their objective is to minimize their own payments.

This reasoning rings like a bell.

cooledcannon • 3 points • 5 September, 2013 08:45 AM

Yeah fuck the government/courts and all they represent. This shit is so retarded.

watersign • 14 points • 5 September, 2013 07:13 AM

the problem with american society is that its not shameful to be a single mother anymore.

[deleted] 5 September, 2013 06:21 PM

[permanently deleted]

30years • 5 points • 6 September, 2013 04:04 AM

I have some reason to believe the veneration of the single mother has caused some people in the area I live to choose to become a single mother for the perceived status.

watersign • 4 points • 5 September, 2013 07:12 PM

exactly, and in turn, they create stupid children as well.

ravenzephyr1 • 9 points • 5 September, 2013 01:57 PM

My parents divorced when I was 8 years old. I was raised by my single mother. She dated 2 guys during the period of time between the divorce and my High school grad.

These guys never tried taking my fathers place, in fact they weren't any considerable factor in my life. My father then passed away when i was 14 and My mother raised me and my siblings just fine as she's a good hardworking person.

There's so much anger here towards single mothers. I personally know a few women who would fit your stereotype and I even look down on them as I feel they are losers and feel bad for the children. But then I feel bad because who am I to judge?

But even these losers will keep on dating, some will find a lovely man will live happy lives. These guys have free will to be with whoever they want, yet you will look down on their happiness and mock them for caring about another mans kid.

NeedsMoreData • 12 points • 5 September, 2013 04:07 PM

Disagreeing with a choice is now mocking? Saying you would make a different choice is mocking?

Would you not say it would have been better to have been raised with 2 parents? Would it then not follow that 1 parent is "less than ideal" or "sub-optimal". Are they trying hard, doing well, sure. But its NOT optimal.

Now with that premise hopefully established, would you want to **encourage** or **discourage** more single parent families?

Keeping in mind that you reward activities you want to encourage and you punish activities you want to discourage.

Not to say we should punish single mothers, but do you see how rewarding them creates more of them and that that is in and of itself a less than great scenario?

ravenzephyr1 • 2 points • 5 September, 2013 06:21 PM

You may disagree with his choice, but is it really any of your business? No one is forcing these men to be with these women and their kids. You can make the choice to never date a single mother and that's fine but how do you know you won't change your mind one day?

I do wish my dad was around but he's dead and I've moved on. When he was alive he spent all the time he had with us that was possible. My parents made sure that everyone was treated fairly.

And can you clarify what you meant by rewarding single mothers? The ones I know with careers work hard and the ones that survive mainly on government assistance are miserable and live in poverty.

[deleted] • 3 points • 5 September, 2013 02:27 PM

I would also suggest the age of the child matters. For the most part, you will run into single mothers with young children, which I think this post is written for, but I found once the child reaches a certain age, around mid-teens, the responsibility or implicit obligation to help out falls away. It's like the child nurturing stage is over and everyone can get back to their lives.

30years • 8 points • 5 September, 2013 03:22 PM*

I disagree. I've been back in the dating pool for a couple months now. I am 50 so the three women I am seeing are in their 40s and all have children in their 20's.

People make jokes about "living in your mother's basement" as if the kid is the loser and at fault. While I agree if you're in your 30's and haven't gotten your life together on any level yet, it probably is your fault, the same is not true for someone in their early 20's.

By the time someone hits 20, they are mainly the product of their parents' choices. If someone is a dependent loser at 20, they had bad parenting.

In my observations-both before dating and now, while dating 3 single moms with kids in their 20's-these women enable their grown children to be losers. The women may be pretty, funny, sexy, smart, but they are not good parents, despite what they say.

And this creates ongoing problems for these women. Last night I went home with a woman after a date. I like her, she's fun and sexy. But when we got to her apartment, her loser 23 year old son was there and is simply an angry loser who treats his mom with contempt while expecting her to wait on him. While going in to the date last night (our 5th) she was my favorite, after meeting her son I am considering never seeing her again. I don't want that kid to be a drain on my life-and he will be. Anyone who gets close to her gets to "enjoy" her parenting failure.

[deleted] • 2 points • 5 September, 2013 04:12 PM

Good point. I haven't run into the 20 year olds still living at home yet and I hope I won't ever have to. I can only imagine how awkward that situation might be.

I'm in my 30s now and have dated single mothers with older children (teens) and I felt it was easier than dating single mothers with younger children; you don't have to find a babysitter, having to take the child every time you go out during the day, the alone time is just less. I feel you're not so much priority three as the kid starts to do their own thing.

It might be some sort of bell curve where the adult child living at home is as problematic as small child, teen being the easiest. Down the road, I really don't look forward to encountering the child adult living at home situation.

JoshtheAspie • 3 points • 5 September, 2013 05:44 PM

Regarding single mothers, I think there is one narrow band where they can realistically get a high quality man.

Start out with a high quality man who has his own children. Perhaps his wife died. Perhaps they are divorced, and she has been in and out of drug programs so often, he's actually got custody of his own children.

In that case, each of you will provide something for the other that is missing, but also provide something for the children.

In this way, the new marriage can be more than the sum of it's parts for all parties involved. Any issues either party brings to the table for being a parent raising children, the other has as well.

This also eliminates some of the need of that single father to father his own children... because he already has them, and he already has custody of them.

lifeaquatic2 • 3 points • 16 September, 2013 05:48 AM

Lets not forget that widows exist.

Ofuqs4u • 3 points • 29 September, 2013 01:49 PM

As a single dad who has dated many a single mom I'd say this is spot on. One more observation that I'll make is that most single moms live the fantasy that they can have something better the second time around. I've ended a few relationships because the woman wanted another baby, another marriage or a blended family because "I want to do it right this time."

It's fucking delusional and they completely ignore the fact that the dynamics are exponentially more complex "this time" when you have to start dealing with the schedules, finances and emotional needs of 2, 3 or 4 families. Not to mention the psychological toll it takes on the children who have to give up personal space, have time with their parent split AGAIN, and generally have their needs valued and devalued based on the needs of a step family who were complete strangers for the majority of their lives. All of this so that the adults don't get lonely.

Life didn't turn out the way you wanted. It never does. And it won't the second time either. Learn to be alone, prioritize your children, and build a life that teaches them to be independent.

Petrarch1603 • 22 points • 5 September, 2013 03:41 AM

It used to be shameful for women to become single mothers. Now its accepted and its causing all sorts of problems for our society. Women who have children out of wedlock have to bear that cross. We need to instill the shame into single mothers to save our society.

Ommin • 18 points • 5 September, 2013 04:41 AM

Women can change society to benefit them, but as of yet, they can't force men to do what they don't want to do.

luxury_banana • 13 points • 5 September, 2013 12:13 PM

This is honestly why I think in the winning strategy for men in the "gender wars" will simply be to not play ball. Despite decades of the facts being out there (see for example Warren Farrell's Myth of Male Power) the MRA angle has only recently broken out into the mainstream due to certain elements like A Voice for Men being very loud and aggressive.

angeliswastaken • 12 points • 5 September, 2013 03:53 AM

As a woman, I think single motherhood SHOULD still be shameful. Other than cases of extreme abuse or death, there is no reason you should have a child and no partner.

RedBigMan • 14 points • 5 September, 2013 04:08 AM

Part of why single moms are trying so hard to hook a man is to substitute for the father so there isn't that stigma.

angeliswastaken • 8 points • 5 September, 2013 03:47 PM

Exactly. The ones it hurts the most are the children who have no choice in the matter and are innocent. If women were more stigmatized by single parenthood, it would be better for their children and for them as they would think twice about their hypergamy and their shitty choices.

Max__Power • -3 points • 5 September, 2013 08:46 AM

As a woman,

Your post would have been valid without this bullshit attempt at qualification. Your opinion is less, not more, valuable because you are a woman, especially so because you felt the need to emphasize your gender as though it inherently gives you more insight into single motherhood.

[deleted] 5 September, 2013 01:36 PM

[permanently deleted]

Max__Power • -1 points • 5 September, 2013 01:58 PM

Hmm. So women and men are the same you say?

[deleted] 5 September, 2013 02:57 PM

[permanently deleted]

Max__Power • 2 points • 5 September, 2013 04:24 PM

The red pill philosophy is based on logic and facts, not feeling and emotion. Do the sexes employ logic and emotion equally, or is there a difference in the way that they think?

Atheistlest • 3 points • 5 September, 2013 05:16 PM

Rating the value of her opinion is your personal feelings, not logic and facts, so you aren't even following the red pill philosophy, as you see it.

Taking this into consideration, how would your response be anything other than worse by the inclusion of this emotional outburst, rather than sticking to strictly logic?

Max___Power • 0 points • 5 September, 2013 07:20 PM

The fact that women think in an emotional manner and not a logical manner is not my opinion. It is a demonstrable fact.

[deleted] 5 September, 2013 05:04 PM

[permanently deleted]

Max___Power • 0 points • 5 September, 2013 07:15 PM

But you are. A woman's insight on a topic based in logic is inherently less valuable than a man's because they do not think in the same manner in which men do. This is not sexism or misogyny, but rather a fact of life based in sexual dimorphism.

angeliswastaken • 0 points • 5 September, 2013 03:45 PM

The qualification is not bullshit. A woman has the potential to become a single mother, therefore my gender does give me more insight into single motherhood. My opinion is no less or more valuable because of my gender, however it is more informed on this topic due to personal experience that a man cannot possess. I have dealt with situations in the past that would have created me a single mother, but I chose options to prevent that because it is a bad decision.

Max___Power • 2 points • 5 September, 2013 04:25 PM

No, it does not.

erwgv3g34 • 2 points • 5 September, 2013 11:21 PM*

Yep. It's all about incentives. If you make it even slightly less miserable to be a single mother, then, at the margin, there are always going to be more women who are willing to risk becoming one by getting involved with sexy bad boys, not getting abortions, etc... and when you both remove the shame and subsidize more babies through the magic of welfare, you end up with what we have today; the collapse of marriage and families as an institution. As this article explains.

[deleted] • 0 points • 1 February, 2014 09:18 AM

If you want to examine this issue, you should read *Les Miserables*

In a nutshell, what society needs is compassion, not shame.

VivalaVeritas • 8 points • 5 September, 2013 02:46 AM

I agree, but have a question. What about widowers with children?

cooledcannon • 24 points • 5 September, 2013 07:05 AM

I dont like dudes, sorry.

[deleted] 5 September, 2013 08:06 AM

[permanently deleted]

VivalaVeritas • 7 points • 5 September, 2013 12:52 PM

Ahhh, I was wondering about u/cooledcannons response.

thegman84 • 15 points • 5 September, 2013 04:42 AM

Men are not impartial gods charged with running the universe, and given infinite cosmic powers with which to do so. They are not here on earth to make sure things are fair to you. They are here to live their own lives, and seek their own happiness.

I wish it were not the case, but life isn't always fair.

[deleted] • 1 point • 5 September, 2013 11:07 PM

it's a completely different thing though

1. it doesn't inherently devalue the woman
2. there's no ex who's there all the time
3. the kids won't necessarily hate you and there's a higher chance they'll accept you

Still not as good as no children, but better than if the ex were still alive.

thegman84 • 1 point • 6 September, 2013 05:24 AM

Still not as good as no children.....

This is really the point I was making.

I mean I agree with everything you said, but realistically, I think many men would prefer a divorced woman with no kids over a widow with kids. But more to the point, one shouldn't feel guilty for that preference. It's not fair for the widow, but it's not our moral obligation to make things fair for her.

[deleted] • 1 point • 6 September, 2013 01:59 PM

I'm not so sure, a widow with 1 kid vs a divorceress without kids :/

The divorceress has fucked up somewhere, obviously.

The widow might have or might have not, that's to be decided on a case by case basis and if you want children and she's willing to have another with you and she has good qualities to offset the foreign child or if your options aren't that good, might go with the widow.

[deleted] • 14 points • 5 September, 2013 04:48 AM

Widowers are a different category. They are really innocent. Unless the father was killed in some gang warfare or criminal activity. They do share the problem of being a package deal. But we can't really hold them morally responsible for something they had nothing to do with.

watersign • 1 point • 5 September, 2013 07:22 AM

Thats entirely different. If someone drops dead due to an accident or illness, it doesnt degrade the quality of a woman.

footballtrav894 points 5 September, 2013 04:05 AM **[recovered]**

In response to number two, you may want to edit in something about widows...they exist.

[deleted] • 9 points • 5 September, 2013 02:43 PM

I don't think he should edit in something about widows. They know who they are, and they can draw their own conclusions if one happens to read it.

Constantly editing and changing what you want to say because you might insult a small group of people's feelings is a waste of time. That's why I like it here.

footballtrav892 points • 5 September, 2013 04:07 PM [recovered]

Thats true...but i really liked his writing and would like to hear what he has to say about this small group.

[deleted] • 6 points • 5 September, 2013 04:12 PM

You could probably piece it together. It's unfortunate, but happens. Some people get in terrible accidents and lose arms/limbs, but they still try to find happiness and their place in the world.

If you're a widow, it's the same deal. The only good thing is you get the benefit of the doubt that you were in a healthy relationship before.

erwgv3g34 • 5 points • 5 September, 2013 11:41 PM

Young widows with children are comparatively rare. The vast majority of single mothers either left their men or hooked up with guys any fucking idiot could have seen were going to abandon them.

luxury_banana • 4 points • 5 September, 2013 12:01 PM

They're usually a lot older than some late teen-early 30s single mother largely described here and not anywhere near as common. Seems like a red herring to me to edit the post to mention this.

[deleted] • 6 points • 5 September, 2013 04:10 PM

Dunno man, I was a widower at 29. Cancer doesn't give a fuck who it kills or how old they are. I don't think it needs an edit, I just wanted to point that out.

HeadingRed • 2 points • 7 September, 2013 04:04 AM

Everyone makes mistakes and needs to live with them. You do not need be the one that makes their mistakes right. If you are even thinking of being with a single mother she needs to bring 2x to the table that you do. If not, not matter how much you love her or think she loves you the fact of the matter is you are still a meal ticket and/or her validation blanket.

One thing she wants (this is very key) is to be able to show to her friends and family that she now has a clean slate and should now be seen as respectable\rational\responsible. Once she thinks she has you the odds are very high that the same shit she pulled with her ex (regardless of whether or not he was a douchebag) will be pulled on you. This is because it worked before.

Worked before you say? No, that's not the case they broke up. HeadingRed you are so wrong, that was the mistake I am the one that's doing it right. Wrong- it work before because she did this and you still decided to take up with her. You think it's wrong solely based on how you act. You are missing the point that her past relationship hit the shitter and she still got a great guy- YOU!

So why shouldn't she do that again?

[deleted] 5 September, 2013 04:38 PM

[permanently deleted]

not-claudius • 2 points • 5 September, 2013 05:23 PM

This is pretty cynical even for redpill lol, do you have some personal experience with this? Never been interested in a single mother thank God lol, but the few I know have absolutely no interest in their ex's.

enticingasthatmaybe • 4 points • 5 September, 2013 06:07 PM

do you have some personal experience with this?

I do, I practically have to slam the door in her face to get my ex to stop trying.

She'll pine for him if the dude rebuilds himself and alphas the fuck up. Especially post wall when his is the closest she gets to alpha attention.

the_red_scimitar • 2 points • 5 September, 2013 07:09 PM*

So, widows were just a bad judge of character? Of course they were.

Edit: To add to this, as a divorced guy, I get it. I don't really care if she has kids. I'm not looking to get married or even live with someone again, and I make that clear. Some women pretend to get it, and think they are gonna change me, and when the reality sinks in - well that's the end of that. Some really DO get it, even with kids. They handle their kids (with their ex) and we do our thing together.

Right now dating a smoking hot mom of 2. Never met her kids - split custody. She's all that in bed, and wants a lot of that kind of attention (and gives it as well) when I see her. She also doesn't think she'd even live with anybody again. So it isn't going to be all cases.

That said - I've dated some who went a while before revealing that, despite their independence of income, dealing with their kids, lives, and having claimed we were on the same page, *eventually* come around to "wanting more". I make it clear there won't be "more" (i.e. me taking care of them), and if that's the end, then so be it. Everything up front, no regrets later.

porcellus_ultor • 4 points • 5 September, 2013 10:14 PM

Widows always seem to be forgotten or lumped in with the "she was an irresponsible skank" single mothers. Unfortunately, I know a number of military wives whose husbands died in combat. They're left raising their children alone through absolutely no fault of their own. They had found that one perfect person they wanted to settle down and spend the rest of their life with, but the sad fact is that warriors die.

And yes, she will "always burn a candle" for her deceased husband. To her, he died a hero. And if a potential partner thinks that she's a scumbag or a basketcase for still holding him in her heart, then that individual has no fucking respect for what those in the military and their families have to go through.

TL;DR Thinly-veiled rant.

wuy3 • 1 point • 10 September, 2013 11:33 PM*

I'm going to be a bit harsh here and say that military widows (or widows of men who had high-risk jobs) must pay their price as well. They knew full well what they were getting themselves into. Raising kids with a guy who could be killed any day is a risky proposition that demands a debt paid in pain and sorrow when bad luck strikes. Men in risky professions are paid higher salaries for their acceptance of life threatening risk, and correspondingly the women should have taken that into account when they get into the relationship/have children. This is why new fathers get out of combat roles to be replaced by fearless single young men who are not responsible for anyone but themselves.

Now I know military pay isn't that great, but you have to see things in a bigger picture. If they could have gotten a better job (less pay but also less risk) I bet a lot of fathers would take that trade if nothing but to sleep sound knowing they'll come home to their kids tomorrow. In the end people made their choices and its up to them to shoulder the responsibility; military widows are not exempt from this.

[deleted] • 2 points • 6 September, 2013 01:25 PM

You should post this somewhere with a lot of women and see their panties get rustled

[deleted] • -3 points • 5 September, 2013 11:50 AM

Not only that, but one would have to be a demented and evil individual to bring an innocent life into this existential and nihilistic existence. There's nothing more evil than to bring a person into this world when you have the power not to.

[deleted] • -7 points • 5 September, 2013 09:58 AM

Or, y'know, her man turned into a drug addict. And, y'know, maybe *she was in love with him*.

[deleted] 5 September, 2013 10:10 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 5 points • 5 September, 2013 02:13 PM

So what? we're supposed to forgive her bad decisions because she was driven by hormones and sexual urges?

[deleted] 5 September, 2013 01:56 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 19 points • 5 September, 2013 02:06 AM

Many of us have the sense to get out of a bad relationship before we have children.

[deleted] 5 September, 2013 02:08 AM

[permanently deleted]

Whisper[S] • 15 points • 5 September, 2013 02:11 AM

Then she's a widow, not a single mother.

You seem confused about when a failed relationship becomes a red flag. Let me highlight for you.

You were once in a relationship, **which you saw as serious enough to have a child in**. That relationship failed.

[deleted] • 8 points • 5 September, 2013 02:12 AM

It doesn't matter what the circumstances are or your perception of them, it is all how the other party views them.

[deleted] • 2 points • 5 September, 2013 07:28 AM

You fucker, why are you deleting your claims? Stand by your arguments.

Edit: I may have sagged the wrong person.